



Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Assessment Resource Center
University of Missouri

Complete this COVER SHEET and place on top of each group of evaluations.

Department: Philosophy
 Contact Person: Jennifer Bennett Phone: 882-2871
 Instructor Name: Kenneth Shields
 Catalog Number and Section: (Example: 1000.04) 1000-02

DIRECTIONS:

1. Use a #2 black lead pencil.
2. Write the correct number in the box and fill in the corresponding bubble below.
3. Darken the bubbles completely.
4. Erase ANY stray marks.
5. Erase completely or use correction tape (NOT a liquid) to make any corrections.

REQUIRED INFORMATION:

This information must be correct. Reports cannot be generated from the accompanying evaluation sheets unless all columns are filled in and the information is correct and accurate.

- 8 digits

This is the employee ID number of the instructor of this class. If ID number has leading 0s, these zeros **must** be entered so that all columns have a number. For student instructors, use their student ID number. *Reminder:* To avoid errors, confirm that the instructor is listed correctly in PeopleSoft before submitting evaluation forms.

- 5 digits

This number is in the Current Class Offerings (Schedule of Classes), column heading "Class." Each class session (e.g., lecture, lab, discussion) will have a unique number. This number will be different each semester.

The semester the class was taught. The year will automatically be added.

14114811 51632

12/15/2015

16-01 00





Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri





Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Group Report for : Shields,Kenneth Wesley; Course: GEN INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Course: PHIL 1000 Section: 02 Semester: FS2016 Class Number: 51632

No. Respondents: 25

Standard Form Report							
Choices: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree	Percent of Responses						
Course Content and Structure	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	# Rsp	Mean
The syllabus clearly explained the course objectives, requirements, and grading system.	64%	32%	0%	0%	4%	25	4.52
Course content was relevant and useful (e.g., readings, online media, classwork, assignments).	44%	48%	4%	0%	4%	25	4.28
Resources (e.g., articles, literature, textbooks, class notes, online resources) were easy to access.	72%	20%	4%	0%	4%	25	4.56
This course challenged me.	48%	24%	12%	12%	4%	25	4.00
Teaching Delivery	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	# Rsp	Mean
This instructor was consistently well-prepared.	56%	40%	0%	0%	4%	25	4.44
This instructor was audible and clear.	60%	28%	8%	0%	4%	25	4.40
This instructor was knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the topic.	76%	16%	4%	0%	4%	25	4.60
This instructor effectively used examples/illustrations to promote learning.	56%	28%	12%	0%	4%	25	4.32
This instructor fostered questions and/or class participation.	56%	28%	12%	0%	4%	25	4.32
This instructor clearly explained important information/ideas/concepts.	54%	29%	13%	0%	4%	24	4.29
This instructor effectively used teaching methods appropriate to this class (e.g., critiques, discussion, demonstrations, group work).	56%	36%	4%	0%	4%	25	4.40
Learning Environment	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	# Rsp	Mean
This instructor responded appropriately to questions and comments.	52%	40%	4%	0%	4%	25	4.36
This instructor stimulated student thinking and learning.	44%	44%	4%	4%	4%	25	4.20
This instructor promoted an atmosphere of mutual respect regarding diversity in student demographics and viewpoints, such as race, gender, or politics.	76%	20%	0%	0%	4%	25	4.64
This instructor was approachable and available for extra help.	64%	20%	12%	0%	4%	25	4.40
This instructor used class time effectively.	52%	32%	12%	0%	4%	25	4.28
This instructor helped students to be independent learners, responsible for their own learning.	44%	44%	8%	0%	4%	25	4.24
Assessment	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	# Rsp	Mean
I was well-informed about my performance during this course.	33%	42%	13%	8%	4%	24	3.92
Assignments/projects/exams were graded fairly based on clearly communicated criteria.	56%	36%	4%	0%	4%	25	4.40
This instructor provided feedback that helped me improve my skills in this subject area.	44%	28%	16%	8%	4%	25	4.00
Teaching Effectiveness	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	# Rsp	Mean
This instructor taught effectively considering both the possibilities and limitations of the subject matter and the course (including class size and facilities).	52%	28%	16%	0%	4%	25	4.24



Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Feedback for Other Students (IDK = I Don't Know)	% Yes	% No	% IDK	# Rsp
Would you recommend this class to other students regarding...?				
CLASS CONTENT	88%	13%	0%	24
CLASS STRUCTURE (E.G., ORGANIZATION, PACING)	92%	8%	0%	24
POSITIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT	96%	4%	0%	24
INSTRUCTOR'S TEACHING SKILL/STYLE	83%	13%	4%	24
FAIRNESS OF GRADING	92%	4%	4%	24

Student Information (NA = Not Applicable, NR = No Response)													
Course	Expected Grade	Class Year	Classes attend	Extent use online	Outside hours per week	Complete work							
Requiremen	52%	A	64%	Freshman	80%	0-25	0%	None	40%	0-3	8%	0-25	0%
Elective	40%	B	28%	Sophomore	20%	26-50	0%	Little	48%	4-7	0%	26-50	0%
Other	4%	C	8%	Junior	0%	51-75	4%	Some	12%	8-11	16%	51-75	8%
NR	4%	D	0%	Senior	0%	76-90	32%	Moderate	0%	12-15	28%	76-90	40%
		F	0%	Graduate	0%	91-100	64%	Large	0%	> 15	32%	91-100	52%
		S	0%	Other	0%	NA	0%	NA	0%	NA	16%	NA	0%
		U	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%	NR	0%
		None	0%										
		NR	0%										

Grade A & B = The mean score of students who reported an expected grade of A or B.

Construct Means (21 Questions)									
Content/Struct		Teaching		Environment		Assessment		Effectiveness	
Mean	4.34	Mean	4.40	Mean	4.35	Mean	4.11	Mean	4.24
Grade A & B	4.38	Grade A & B	4.44	Grade A & B	4.39	Grade A & B	4.17	Grade A & B	4.30

COMPOSITE SCORE of the 21 Construct Questions	
Mean	4.33
Grade A & B	4.37

Construct Means and Composite Score are calculated based on the number of respondents for each question in order to apply less weight to questions not applicable to a class.



Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Group Report for: Shields, Kenneth Wesley; Course: GEN INTRO TO PHILOSOPHY

Course: PHIL 1000 Section: 02 Semester: FS2016 Class Number: 51632

Section VI: Your Comments Are Valued

What aspects of the teaching or content of this course were especially good?

The instructor was extremely passionate and knowledgeable about the course. He used many different styles of visual aid/ assignments/ teaching methods to maintain my interest in the class.

The lessons were well thought out and the content made sense.

Talking about the readings and their meanings during class

when you asked a question went into great detail to make us understand.



Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Usage of visual aids to help with deeper understanding of topics.

Kenny is very enthusiastic and passionate about philosophy. He also makes a huge effort to motivate students to question and think more deeply -

N/A

He threw a ball around and put himself in a "penalty box" to let us have our voices heard without him interrupting.

I think all were good, and I was very interested in all the topics



Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

-The Artificial Intelligence content was really good

He related the material to us in a way that we could easily understand. Was very passionate about teaching and strived to make us do the best we could.

video examples

enthusiasm

He truly cares about us as students.



Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

He takes his time to ensure class is engaging and thorough

Class discussions

Was very open-minded and willing to help. ^{The instructor}

*Friendly, kind, and thoughtful instructor
* Liked in class discussions



Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

What changes could be made to improve the teaching or the content of this course?

Reading comps and their specific due dates could be easier to access online.

06/01/2016

17-02.00

Assignments other than reading comps.

06/01/2016

17-02.00

Giving more information before discussions.

06/01/2016

17-02.00

Assignments other than reading comps.

06/01/2016

17-02.00

Sometimes he would ramble on and get a little off topic but it would usually bring up a good conversation.

06/01/2016

17-02.00





Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

06/01/2016

17-02.00

06/01/2016

17-02.00

less student led discussion. More lecture and Q & A.

06/01/2016

17-02.00

06/01/2016

17-02.00

NIP

06/01/2016

17-02.00





Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

06/01/2016

17-02.00

Nothing, I wouldn't change anything

06/01/2016

17-02.00

- You could make people talk more by having a spot in the class where you have open discussion whether it be questions or comments.

06/01/2016

17-02.00

None.

06/01/2016

17-02.00

06/01/2016

17-02.00





Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

better discussion methods

06/01/2016

17-02.00

A different seating arrangement that fostered conversation

06/01/2016

17-02.00

06/01/2016

17-02.00

06/01/2016

17-02.00

06/01/2016

17-02.00





Evaluation of Instruction and Course

University of Missouri

Don't be so nervous; confidence is key!

06/01/2016

17-02.00

N/A

06/01/2016

17-02.00

Feedback and grading style

06/01/2016

17-02.00

Having the due dates of assignments online

06/01/2016

17-02.00

*More involvement of rest of class during class discussions

06/01/2016

17-02.00
